

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

FRACTUS, S.A.,

Plaintiff,

V.

AT&T MOBILITY LLC,

T-MOBILE US, INC., T-MOBILE USA,  
INC.,

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC.,  
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON  
WIRELESS,

Defendants.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-00135-JRG**  
**LEAD CASE**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-00137-JRG**  
**MEMBER CASE**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-00138-JRG**  
**MEMBER CASE**

## ORDER


Before the Court is Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to File Reply to Defendants’ and Intervenor-Defendants’ Opposition to Factus S.A.’s Motion for Leave to Amend Complaints (the “Motion”). (Dkt. No. 332.) Having considered the Motion and noting that it is unopposed, the Court is of the opinion that the Motion should be and hereby is **GRANTED**.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff shall file its Reply in support of its Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaints (Dkt. No. 298) no later than **June 5, 2019**.

Additionally, the Court notes that this Motion was submitted one business day before the deadline it sought to extend. While true emergencies may at times necessitate such a late filing, the Court finds that last-minute motions to extend deadlines unduly burden the Court and risk compromising a party's rights in the event such a motion is denied. *See* ABA Model Rule 1.3, cmt. 3; *see also* L.R. AT-3(j) ("The court is not bound to accept agreements of counsel to extend

deadlines imposed by rule or court order.”). Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that any future motions to extend deadlines shall be filed no later than three (3) business days before the earliest deadline for which extension is sought or shall state good cause why the motion could not be filed by such time.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 3rd day of June, 2019.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY GILSTRAP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE